

### REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-8 have again been rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) and claim 9 has again been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a). Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, and 9 have been amended and claims 3-6 have been canceled without prejudice. Accordingly, after entry of this amendment, the pending claims will be claims 1, 2, 7, 8, and 9.

The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application and the Examiner's granting a telephone interview on October 31, 2005. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the subject application based on the above amendments and the following remarks.

### 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,511,150 to Beaudet, et al. ("Beaudet" or the "Beaudet Reference"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the grounds for these rejections based on the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1 and 2 now have been amended to recite the limitations of Claims 3 and 4 respectively. In particular, Claims 1 and 2 as amended hereinabove recite that the claimed computing means calculates a **finish time of the requested interrupt job** and the claimed a display means that displays **the finish time of the interrupt job**. Contrary to the Examiner's assertions in the Official Action dated 27 September 2005, these features are not taught, mentioned or suggested by the Beaudet reference. Specifically, Figures 4F1 and 4F2 of the Beaudet reference merely display the facts that a second (permissibly an "interrupt") job is currently scanning for storage in JIB 48 (Fig. 4F1), or is completely scanned and waiting in storage (Fig. 4F2), pending the end of the then ongoing job whose time remaining and other status information in fact are displayed, i.e., set 124 of 200 of printing job 1234, **time remaining 5 mins 37 secs** (emphasis added).

There simply is no mention in the Beaudet reference of calculating or displaying the after printing finish time of a requested interrupt job.

Even in the case of an immediate current job interruption, the Beaudet display is limited to an indication of a time until interrupt will occur (see Fig. 4I) in order to allow the already started portions of the current print job to be completed. Thereafter, the display of Fig. 4J is displayed for a set period of time within which an interrupt job must be started or the system reverts back to the originally interrupted job. Again, Applicants respectfully emphasize that at no time does the Beaudet reference calculate or display the finish time for a requested interrupt job. Hence, the Beaudet reference is respectfully submitted to be insufficient to justify an anticipation rejection in this application as now amended.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that, claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 satisfy all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 100, et seq., especially § 102(b). Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 are allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

#### 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected claim 9 under 35 USC §103(a) as being made obvious by Beaudet in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,327,487 to Brown, et al. ("Brown" or the Brown Reference"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the grounds for this rejection based on the following remarks.

The deficiencies of the Beaudet reference have been described above in our discussion of the § 102(b) rejections. Further, the Brown reference cannot make up for these deficiencies because the Brown reference does not teach, mention or suggest computing means that calculate a finish time of the requested interrupt job and display means that display the finish time of the interrupt job.

It is respectfully submitted that, claim 9 satisfies all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 100, et seq., especially § 103(a). Accordingly, claim 9 is allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

If for any reason a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge or credit Deposit Account No. **04-1105**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 23, 2005

By: David A. Tucker  
David A. Tucker  
Reg. No. 27,840  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE, LLP  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, MA 02205  
(617) 517-5523  
Customer No.: 21,874  
515100